Quality Spine Care

Healthcare Systems, Quality Reporting, and Risk Adjustment

John Ratliff
Todd J. Albert
Joseph Cheng
Jack Knightly
Editors

Springer

Quality Spine Care

John Ratliff • Todd J. Albert
Joseph Cheng • Jack Knightly
Editors

Quality Spine Care

Healthcare Systems, Quality Reporting, and Risk Adjustment

Springer

Editors
John Ratliff
Department of Neurosurgery
Stanford University
Stanford, CA
USA

Joseph Cheng
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH
USA

Todd J. Albert
Hospital for Special Surgery
New York, NY
USA

Jack Knightly
Atlantic Neurosurgical Specialists
Morristown, NJ
USA

ISBN 978-3-319-97989-2 ISBN 978-3-319-97990-8 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97990-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018957706

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To my wife, Carla Carvalho, and my children Maya and Jessica. Their patience throughout this process and the many, many other commitments that have taken me sometimes far from home has made everything I have accomplished possible. I owe it all to them.

John Ratliff

To my children Stuart, Elliot, and Emily who have taught me the Quality of Life and Love.

Todd J. Albert

I dedicate this work to my wife Rebecca and my son Josh. Their love and support means the world to me.

Joe Cheng

I would like to dedicate my work in this effort to my wife Sharon and my children Jake, Kieran, Carlie, and Anna for the time and encouragement they gave me to pursue this project.

Jack Knightly

Foreword

The provision of quality care is often assumed but infrequently delivered. Such is perhaps more evident in the spine arena than in any other in clinical medicine. The assumption of quality is a dangerous assumption indeed. The documentation of the study of quality, on the other hand, provides a grounding, if you will, that provides a foundation for the study quality and the palpable achievement of high quality.

Ratliff, Cheng, Albert, and Knightly have pieced together a masterful work that addresses the many facets of quality spine care. They pursue the past, looking to learn from prior experiences. They present metrics, methodologies, and strategies that can be used to objectivize the assessment of quality. They go on to present and analyze existing healthcare systems, in order to assess the current status quo and to provide a spring board for continuous improvement via quality reporting, the coordination and alignment of the variety of healthcare systems, and the operationalization of systems on a single institution, as well as national, basis.

In the pages that follow, the keys to quality spine care optimization lie. The more we all work with the same goal in mind, in an organized manner, the faster we will achieve optimal value in the spine arena. Please read with an open mind and apply with enthusiasm.

Cleveland, OH, USA — Mike Steinmetz
Cleveland, OH, USA — Ed Benzel

Preface

I have always been fascinated by the business aspects of healthcare. It may come from having spent the vast majority of my adult life working at academic medical centers, where many of the day-to-day challenges of running an enterprise are kept at arm's length. Even in academics, though, practitioners face daily reminders of the impact of insurance coverage, or lack thereof, on the capacity of patients to enjoy high-value care. Coverage policies and restrictions on beneficiary hospital access based upon whether or not a center meets a payer's distinction as a "center of excellence" all limit patient choices and influence patient care.

These soft approaches to rationing healthcare, through restricting choice and controlling access, may have profound effects on our patients. Maintaining patient access to care should be the primary goal of physician advocates in this space.

I learned the US system of healthcare finance through tutelage at the American Medical Association's Resource-Based Relative Value Scale (RBRVS) Update Committee (RUC), with the mentorship of giants like Greg Przybylski, Rick Boop, and John Wilson, after a supportive nudge from James Bean. Over many years, I developed the skill set necessary to navigate the arcana of the RUC and to advocate for neurosurgical patients. Concomitant with volunteering at the RUC, I was fortunate enough to have two mentors who join me as co-editors on this text. Joe Cheng contributed vastly to my understanding of coding and reimbursement and to my ability to teach these topics to others. Jack Knightly, following in the footsteps of thought leaders like Robert Harbaugh and Dan Resnick, helped me understand the separate, equally arcane system of quality improvement and quality reporting. Borrowing from Eisenhower, Knightly refers to it as the "quality-industrial complex." Last but certainly not least, my other co-editor Todd J. Albert, with Alex Vaccaro and others at Thomas Jefferson University, taught me the value of integrated systems and the strength that orthopedic and neurosurgical physicians can wield when working together.

I saw, as I started volunteering in both the RUC and neurosurgery's Quality Improvement Workgroup, how these two systems were coming together and how quality would take a greater and greater role in healthcare finance and access.

Hence the impetus of this text. There are many textbooks that cover the technical aspects of operative spine care. I know of none that provide surgeons with insight into the equally challenging aspects of healthcare delivery and quality assessment.

I hope this volume will provide a succinct overview of a variety of aspects of quality as applied to spine care.

I am especially indebted to my international authors, who provide insights into healthcare in China, Japan, England, Australasia, and India, and how quality is assessed within their systems. I sought international authors to see how the challenges of quality assessment and healthcare finance are met in other countries—I wondered if anyone else had come any closer than the USA to having this "figured out." I learned so much from reading their chapters and from reviewing the challenges faced in these disparate healthcare environments.

I hope you enjoy this text as much as my co-editors and I have enjoyed compiling it. Our authors have done a phenomenal job of compacting a tremendous volume of information into a concise 24 chapters. We hope you enjoy it.

Stanford, CA, USA John Ratliff

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge first and foremost the contributions of my co-editors. Their guidance and mentoring throughout my career has been invaluable. I would also like to thank Dr. Iwasaki, for completing the Japan chapter with an unacceptably short lead time. His dedication to spine care is exemplary. Finally I would like to thank Alex Vaccaro for his friendship and guidance. Our authors have made this textbook possible, and we are in their debt.

John Ratliff

Contents

Contributors

Owoicho Adogwa, MD, MPH Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, USA

Deepak Venkatesh Agarkhed, BEng, MBA Sakra World Hospital, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Todd J. Albert, MD Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

Weill Cornell Medical School, New York, NY, USA

Mohammed Ali Alvi, MBBS Mayo Clinic Neuro-Informatics Laboratory, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Department of Neurologic Surgery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Christopher P. Ames, MD Department of Neurosurgery, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Brian L. Anderson, MD, MHA Department of Neurosurgery, Penn State University, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, PA, USA

Bryan Ashman, MBBS, MsurgEd, FRACS Division of Surgery, Canberra Hospital, Garran, ACT, Australia

Johannes A. Bernbeck, MD Orthopedics-Spine, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Downey, CA, USA

Erica F. Bisson, MD, MPH Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical Neurosciences Center, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Harsimran S. Brara, MD, FAANS Neurosurgery, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Lee M. Breakwell, MBChB, MSc, FRCS(Tr&Orth) Sheffield Children's Hospital, Sheffield, UK

Daniel Burkett, MD Department of Neurosurgery, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA

Mohamad Bydon, MD Mayo Clinic Neuro-Informatics Laboratory, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Department of Neurologic Surgery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

John Chen Li Tat, MBBS(NUI), BAO, LRCSI, FRCS(Ed) Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore, Singapore

Joseph Cheng, MD, MS Department of Neurosurgery, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, OH, USA

Xiongying Chen, MD, PhD Jackson Hospitalist Program, Jackson Hospital, Montgomery, AL, USA

Ashley A. Cole, BMedSci, FRCS, DM Sheffield Children's Hospital, Sheffield, UK

Chad M. Craig, MD, FACP Spine Service, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery and Department of Medicine, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

Atman M. Desai, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Melissa R. Dunbar, MPH Department of Neurosurgery, Lahey Hospital & Medical Center, Burlington, MA, USA

Mohamed Elminawy, MBBCh Mayo Clinic Neuro-Informatics Laboratory, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Department of Neurologic Surgery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Eric J. Feuchtbaum, MD Spine Center, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

T. J. Florence, PhD Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, NY, USA

Takahito Fujimori, MD, PhD Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Japan Community Healthcare Organization, Osaka Hospital, Osaka, Japan

Julian L. Gendreau, BS Mercer University School of Medicine, Macon, GA, USA

Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Zoher Ghogawala, MD, FACS Department of Neurosurgery, Lahey Hospital & Medical Center, Burlington, MA, USA

Department of Neurosurgery, Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

Jonathan N. Grauer, MD Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

Kern H. Guppy, MD, PhD Neurosurgery, The Kaiser Permanente Medical Group, Sacramento, CA, USA

Michael Gutman, BA Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clayton Haldeman, MD Department of Neurosurgery, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA

Robert E. Harbaugh, MD, FAANS, FACS, FAHA Department of Neurosurgery, Penn State University, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, PA, USA

Omid R. Hariri, DO, MSc Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Jessica Harris, MS, RD Surgical Outcomes and Analysis, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego, CA, USA

Allen L. Ho, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Michael James Hutton, MBBS, BSc, FRCS Princess Elisabeth Orthopaedic Centre, Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital, Exeter, UK

Motoki Iwasaki, MD, PhD Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Osaka Rosai Hospital, Osaka University Graduate School of Medicine, Sakai, Japan

David A. Janiec, MBA Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Kareem J. Kebaish, BA Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

Jack Knightly, MD Atlantic Neurosurgical Specialists, Morristown, NJ, USA

Sandro M. Krieg, MD, MBA Department of Neurosurgery, Universitätsklinikum rechts der Isar der Technischen Universität München, Munich, Germany

Virginie Lafage, PhD Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

Mayan Lendner, BS Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Catherine H. MacLean, MD, PhD Center for the Advancement of Value in Musculoskeletal Care, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

Gabriel S. Makar, BS Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Bernhard Meyer, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Universitätsklinikum rechts der Isar der Technischen Universität München, Munich, Germany

John E. O'Toole, MD, MS Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, USA

Griffin H. Olsen, MD Surgical Services Clinical Program, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, UT, USA

Taylor D. Ottesen, BS Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

Mark J. Ott, MD Central Region Administration, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, UT, USA

Paul Samuel Page, MD Department of Neurosurgery, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA

Tejbir Singh Pannu, MD, MS Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

Arjun Vivek Pendharkar, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Zach Pennington, BS Department of Neurosurgery, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA

Xiang Qian, MD, PhD Anesthesiology, Preoperative and Pain Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

John Ratliff, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Daniel K. Resnick, MD, MS Department of Neurosurgery, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA

Pratik Rohatgi, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Penn State University, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, PA, USA

Satish Rudrappa, MCh, FASS, FRCS Neurosciences Department, Sakra World Hospital, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Clemens M. Schirmer, MD, PhD Comprehensive Stroke Center, Department of Neurosurgery and Neuroscience Institute, Geisinger, Danville, PA, USA

Frank J. Schwab, MD Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

Jonathan P. Scoville, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical Neurosciences Center, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Ehab Shiban, PD Dr. med. Department of Neurosurgery, Universitätsklinikum rechts der Isar der Technischen Universität München, Munich, Germany

Eric S. Sussman, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

Ariel Takayanagi, DO Department of Neurosurgery, Riverside University Health Systems, Moreno Valley, CA, USA

Luis M. Tumialán, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Barrow Neurological Institute, St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Alexander R. Vaccaro, MD, PhD, MBA Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Sushrut S. Vaidya, BA Economics Department, International College of Liberal Arts (iCLA), Kofu, Yamanashi Prefecture, Japan

Christina Vannello, BSN Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Arvin R. Wali, MD Department of Neurosurgery, University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

Michael E. West, BBA, CPA, MBA Rothman Institute, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Corinna C. Zygourakis, MD Department of Neurosurgery, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA

Part I

Historical Aspects

Historical Aspects of Quality in Healthcare

1

Omid R. Hariri, Ariel Takayanagi, T. J. Florence, and Arvin R. Wali

Introduction: Quality in Healthcare

Quality. 1. [noun] the standard of something as measured against other things of a similar kind; the degree of excellence of something. [1]

Optimization of patient value should be at the center of any successful healthcare system [2]. This can be achieved by maximizing the quality of care while minimizing costs. This is demonstrated in Michael Porter's healthcare value equation (value = quality/cost) in which value is a function of benefit and cost.

In a patient-centered healthcare system, the numerator, quality, should be measured in terms of outcomes that matter to patients [3]. The most widely used clinical measures for quality, such as the Physician Quality Reporting System, are process measures. Although process measures are easier to obtain than outcomes measures and are valuable in assessing diagnostic and procedural practices, they do not necessarily correlate with outcomes [4]. In order to create treatment algorithms based on outcomes rather than process, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has created provisions such as the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute to identify the most effective forms of treatment [4, 5].

O. R. Hariri (✉)
Department of Neurosurgery, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
e-mail: ohariri@stanford.edu

A. Takayanagi
Department of Neurosurgery, Riverside University Health Systems, Moreno Valley, CA, USA

T. J. Florence
Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, NY, USA

A. R. Wali
Department of Neurosurgery, University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

J. Ratliff et al. (eds.), *Quality Spine Care*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97990-8_1

The International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement (ICHOM) was founded on the principles described in Michael Porter's and Elizabeth Teisburg's *Redefining Healthcare* principles. ICHOM works with physicians, patients, and registries, to create a global standard for outcome measures according to medical condition.

Porter stratifies outcomes that matter to patients into a tier system to better define healthcare quality for patients. This comprehensive assessment of quality includes the direct outcomes (mortality and degree of recovery from the medical condition), failures in the treatment process, time of recovery, and long-term outcomes [3]. Improving quality in any of these realms can reduce cost and increase the value of care. A recent version of the equation has incorporated "service," or patient satisfaction (value = (quality+service)/cost), to include the patient's evaluation of the care received [6].

Many approaches exist to reduce cost, the denominator in the value equation. One approach is to focus on reducing costs in the highest-cost patients [5]. Porter and ICHOM's approach is to measure cost as the total expense incurred for the full cycle of care for the specific medical condition across specialties, rather than dividing cost by specialty or type of service. This allows for a patient-centered measurement of cost [7].

Although patient value should be at the center of the healthcare system, it is important to consider the impact that quality of care has on other stakeholders as well.

Stakeholders in Quality of Care

Quality of care can be considered in terms of three stakeholders: the patient, the payer, and society.

The Patient

Quality of healthcare is determined by the system's ability to meet the patient's individual needs. Most important is the ability to provide well-planned care and manage a patient's medical condition by providing necessary treatment options. For example, a patient who suffers from severe back pain due to metastatic spinal disease may not be able to sustain open back surgery but may benefit from minimally invasive techniques such as cement augmentation or separation surgery [8]. The availability of such options helps to meet a patient's needs and increase the quality of provided care.

Another patient interest to consider is functional status. Not only does it affect a patient's autonomy and quality of life but also his or her ability to earn wages and provide for one's family [9].

Although providing service that leads to patient satisfaction is important, the patient's perception of quality of care does not necessarily correlate with health

status. In a study that examined the relationship between quality of surgical spine care and patient satisfaction, improvement in quality of life and improvement in general health were not associated with patient satisfaction [10]. In addition, perception of quality of care may be influenced by socioeconomic status, educational, and cultural backgrounds [11].

The Payer

In short, payers foot the proximal costs of health treatments – the literal common denominator of the Utah value equation. Naively, one expects payers to work to minimize costs. Yet payers in the United States represent a heterogenous group: the American healthcare system is an amalgam of different payer entities. Thus what constitutes cost minimization, and therefore value maximization, for payers in practice is a nuanced question affected by incentives unique to each group. Here we will consider three views of the payer perspective of value in spine care: from large government agencies like Medicare, from private insurance companies, and from society as a whole.

Government Agencies

The US government runs two massive healthcare payer agencies in Medicare and Medicaid. Across all programs, the government is responsible for paying for the care of roughly 107 million people at a total cost of $1.2 trillion/year [12]. Several factors make government agencies particularly sensitive to emphasizing high-value, high-quality procedures. Foremost is the dual challenge of rising enrollment and rising medical costs in the setting of the political impossibility of significant budget expansion. Moreover, Medicare patients represent an elder segment of the US population; medical expenditures for those 65 and older are roughly three times higher than someone closer to the median US citizen ($18,988 vs $6632) [13]. Finally, Medicare cares for patients over the long term – essentially from enrollment to the grave. These pressures likely account for the recent heavy focus on quality assessment with the Performance Quality Rating System (PQRS). From a neurosurgical perspective, PQRS is notable for its emphasis on measuring and explicitly improving functional outcomes after treatment along the neuraxis. In effect, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has challenged spine surgeons to demonstrate the value of their procedures.

Private Health Insurance

Private health insurance remains the majority payment model in the US health system. Estimates vary, but roughly two thirds of Americans are covered by private health insurance plans at a total cost of $1.1 trillion dollars per year. Probability of private coverage is associated with both income and full-versus-part-time working status; thus the privately insured population tends to be wealthier (and therefore healthier) than the publicly insured. Moreover, insurance is closely tied to one's employment: around 80% of all private insurance policies are employer-provided policies.

This has interesting consequences for the incentive structure of private insurance companies. The customers of private insurance companies are most often not patients themselves but their employers. For publicly traded companies, ultimate responsibility lies with creating value for shareholders. Moreover, in the modern economy, employment durations may be brief; loss of employment leads to loss of coverage. Indeed, in a 3-year period from January 2009 to December 2012, 35.1 percent of Americans were uninsured for at least 1 month. The average period without insurance was 17.4 months, or more than half of that period. Thus a single private insurance company is relatively decoupled from the long-term consequences of a given procedure. An efficacious procedure from the perspective of private insurance is one with minimal operative costs for a given indication, short recovery time, and proven efficacy in the near-to-middle term. All told, private insurance companies wield significant influence in shaping current practices via selective reimbursement of procedures. These factors likely shape the apparent arbitrariness with which these decisions are reached [14].

Society

Ultimately, society bears the cost of all healthcare expenditures. Every dollar spent on healthcare is one not spent on infrastructure, science, or education. All told, the United States spent $3.3 trillion on healthcare expenditures in 2016. This represents outlays of roughly $10,350 per person, or 17% of gross domestic product. These numbers are only projected to grow. It is a tired fact by now that on a per-dollar basis, health outcomes in the United States are significantly worse than similar western industrialized countries.

As political and economic pressure builds to address these disparities, surgeons can play a leading role in ensuring system-wide quality. The public requires surgeons who offer validated, reliable procedures only when indicated. We must continue our efforts to minimize complications and prevent reoperations. While these are characteristics common to good surgeons, perhaps less appreciated are their cumulative effects on the health system as a whole.

Society

The interest of the entire population must be considered when evaluating quality of care in terms of society as a whole [15]. Because society spans across more than one generation, the goals for achieving high-quality care are long term [16]. For example, a society may invest in preventative care to decrease healthcare expenses of preventable diseases.

Clear guidelines on patient selection for treatment are beneficial to prevent unnecessary costs to society. In a study of elderly patients who underwent surgery for lumbar spinal stenosis, comorbid disease and increasing age were shown to be associated with an increased risk of major complications, rehospitalization, and discharge to skilled nursing facility; all of which are costly to society [17].

In addition to reducing direct medical care expenses, careful patient selection may prevent loss of productivity. A study examining risk factors for loss of work productivity after surgery for lumbar disc herniation revealed that patients with severe disability and poor motivation to work were more likely to require an extended time off work [18]. The study suggests that patients who are at risk of a poor outcome should receive vocational counseling and early rehabilitation in order to prevent a loss of employment. Incorporating measures to prevent unemployment into healthcare may help patients return to work sooner and continue to contribute to society.

Historical Perspectives on Assessing Quality in Spinal Surgery

Introduction

Over the years, surgeons care deeply about providing their patients high-quality procedures; patients themselves must trust their surgeons to provide high-quality care. Ongoing assessment of quality in spinal surgery remains fundamental to ensuring acceptable outcomes, solidifying trust between patient and provider, and improving the practice altogether. Toward these goals, spine surgeons require tools to assess current practices and new procedures. Ideally, such measures should be objective, easy to administer, and standardized to facilitate comparison.

While today discussions of quality of care may be dominated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Physician Quality Reporting System (CMS PQRS), physicians have been interested in the objective assessment of the effectiveness of their interventions throughout the history of modern medicine. In this section, we will trace the evolution of objective quality assessment in spinal surgery from the twentieth century to the present. As we will see, this development occurred in a saltatory fashion. It remains interesting to consider societal and resource constraints driving development.

Early Period (1930s–1980s)

The earliest modern tool for assessing outcome quality in bony surgery is the Massachusetts General Hospital Anatomic Economic Functional Rating System (MGHAEF) [19]. Developed in the late 1920s by the Fracture Service at MGH, it was popularized during the early 1930s during the height of the Great Depression. Originally applied to measure outcomes of reduction of compound fracture of the lower limb, this scale is remarkably modern. Authors of MGHAEF recognized the need to report the multidimensional outcomes of surgical treatment, both on the bone itself and on the life of the patient.

The scale consists of three dimensions, each scored from zero to four. The anatomic limb exploited the then-recent proliferation of medical X-ray imaging to evaluate the success of intervention on bone healing, with aligned healing as the

Table 1.1 The Massachusetts General Hospital Anatomic Economic Functional Rating System as applied to spinal fusion surgery

Anatomic		Economic		Functional	
A0	Pseudarthrosis	E0	Completely invalid	F0	Pain worse than before surgery
A1	Unilateral pseudarthrosis	E1	No gainful occupation	F1	Pain the same as before surgery; can perform daily tasks of living
A2	Insufficient unilateral fusion mass	E2	Able to work but did not return to previous occupation	F2	Low level of pain; able to perform all activities except sport
A3	Contiguous fusion mass without hypertrophy	E3	Returned to previous occupation in limited status	F3	Rare, brief recurrences of pain or sciatica
A4	Solid fusion with hypertrophy	E4	Returned to previous occupation without restriction	F4	No pain even during sport

Data from Vanti et al. [20]

best outcome and pseudarthrosis as the worst. The economic outcome dimension evaluated a patient's capacity to return to work at >1 year, with return to work without restriction as the desired outcome and completely invalid as the least desirable. The functional limb concerned a patient's pain. On this scale, highest scores were awarded to pain-free patients, and lowest scores were assigned to patients whose pain increased following surgery. Complete scores were recorded in compound notation: thus a patient with a perfect outcome would be reported as $A_4E_4F_4$, a convention that would carry forward.

Over decades, this scale was modified ad hoc to suit the needs of inquiring surgeons on their area of expertise. A complete, modern version of MGHAEF applied to spine fusion surgery is demonstrated in Table 1.1 [20].

Modern Assessments (1980s–Present)

During the 1980s, as aging baby boomers began to experience the consequences of spine degeneration, spine surgery quality metric assessments were revisited. The first conceptually significant example is work done by Dawson et al. [21] in a case series of 58 patients undergoing lumbar arthrodesis via autologous bone graft. Patients were graded via a modified MGHAEF scale both pre- and postoperatively; as the goal of surgery was not to achieve normal preoperative anatomy, the anatomic scale was dropped from preoperative assessment. Importantly, though successful fusion was observed in 92% of cases, economic and functional improvements were noted in only 70–80%.

To critics of the MGHAEF method, this suggested that ultimate impact on the patient may be a more salient feature of quality assessment, even as surgeons strive for technical perfection. This idea was likely at the forefront of the mind of Donald

Table 1.2 The Prolo scale

Economic		Functional	
E1	Completely invalid	F1	Total incapacity (or worse than before operation)
E2	No gainful occupation (including housework or retirement activities)	F2	Mild-moderate level of low back pain and/or sciatica (or pain the same as before but able to perform ADLs)
E3	Able to work not at previous occupation	F3	Low level of pain; able to perform all activities except sport
E4	Working at previous occupation at part time or limited status	F4	Rare, brief recurrences of pain or sciatica
E5	Able to work at previous occupation without restriction	F5	No pain even during sport

Data from Vanti et al. [20] and Prolo et al. [22]

J. Prolo, MD, as he developed his eponymous scale for quantitative assessment of lumbar surgery outcomes [20]. Originally outlined in a case series of 34 patients undergoing posterior laminar interbody fusion (PLIF), the Prolo scale is bidimensional: only economic and functional outcomes contribute to a patient's score. Explicit rating of anatomical outcome is dropped completely. Along the remaining dimensions, outcomes are classified along a scale from 1 to 5. Along the economic axis, these outcomes range from E1 (complete invalid) to E5 (able to return to work without restriction). Along the functional axis, outcome rage from F1 (total incapacity, or worse than before surgery) to F5 (complete recovery, no pain even with sport). Outcomes are also noted in compound notation; thus the best possible score on the Prolo scale would be reported E_5F_5.

This approach has distinct advantages. First, it is aligned with clinical reasoning: mild anatomic imperfections not causing symptoms are by definition clinically insignificant; conversely, a patient presenting with pain would only have anatomy evaluated secondarily. Moreover, without an imaging requirement, the scale is significantly cheaper and easier to administer. It is robust to retroactive application even in the face of incomplete records. Third, without specific anatomical scoring, the scale is easily generalizable to multiple regions of the body. Finally, non-zero integer notation allows for ratiometric comparison of functional status before and after surgery within single patients. The complete Prolo scale is demonstrated in Table 1.2.

Legislative Assessments of Quality

The development of spine-specific metrics for quality assessment occurred in parallel to an evolving social and legal framework for evaluating quality of medical care more generally. As these considerations tend to dominate discussions of quality, it is worth briefly discussing their development here.

The creation of Medicare and Medicaid in 1965 led to a need to ensure basic measures of quality and consistency of medical care. To this end, Congress created a set of "Conditions of Participation" or requirements hospitals must meet to receive

payments from these programs. Such requirements included round-the-clock nursing and complete staff credentialing and submission to utilization review. This practice review was performed by a rotation of several official bodies: In 1972, the task fell to Utilization Review Committees (URCs), which were widely seen as ineffective due to absence of formal evaluation criteria. Soon after, URCs gave way to Professional Standards Review Organizations (PSROs), networks of physician-run nonprofits mandated to evaluate provided quality of care. Unable to contain costs, PSROs were replaced Peer Review Organizations (PROs) in 1983. These new PROs had a more specific mission to reduce complication, readmission, and mortality; moreover, they were given authority to implement solutions. The PRO model is generally accepted to be more successful than prior review bodies and continues to play a role under Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. These efforts by Congress to ensure care quality via legislation are supplemented by nonprofit organizations, including the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAH) and the National Academy of Medicine (formerly the Institute of Medicine).

Contemporary efforts toward quality improvement have trended toward incentivized public reporting. Surgical teams lead this trend with the establishment of the Surgical Care Improvement Program (SCIP) in 2003. Aimed at reducing surgical complications and mortality, SCIP constituted a voluntary reporting database with payments provided by Medicare for participation. The SCIP blueprint was used to develop the Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS) created by Congress with the passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in 2010 [4].

Future of Quality Assessment

Current Quality Assessment Metrics

Several methods are available to assess the quality of life of patients. These quality assessments may be collected at any point during a patient's medical or surgical treatment plan. Metrics typically utilized for quality assessment include patient questionnaires such as the SF-36, EuroQol, or Oswestry Disability Index [23–25]. These metrics serve as markers of efficacy for clinical interventions or may be mathematically converted into health utility scores such as quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) providing a more robust means of measuring clinical outcome than with longevity alone.

Given the diversity of terminology and metrics used in quality-of-life questionnaires, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in 2004 led a multicenter initiative to develop the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) to further standardize, validate, and enhance patient-reported outcomes (PROs) across multiple medical conditions [26]. Embracing the electronical health record (EHR), PROMIS utilizes computer adaptive tests (CATs) to assess for severity of numerous symptoms such as pain, fatigue, depression, anxiety, and physical functionality for patients with diverse medical conditions [26, 27]. PROMIS has the potential to unify PROs in an efficient, computerized manner with consistent recorded values and terminology to serve as a universal quality assessment for all patients [28].

Integration of Quality Metrics into EHR Systems

The future of quality assessment lies in the capacity of the EHR to serve as a data repository for PROs to capture quality-of-life information for millions of patients at different intervals of their treatment. Efforts such as PROMIS offer the possibility of creating a universal quality assessment language to describe patient quality of life during any treatment plan for any medical condition in any healthcare setting. As clinicians become more familiar with quality assessment, these metrics and questionnaires will become routinely collected clinical variables similar to the collection of vital signs or physical exam findings. Prior investigations have demonstrated the feasibility of collecting quality assessment data utilizing the EHR as part of routine clinical work flow without prolonging average visit time for each patient [29]. Big data analytics of this large volume of clinical data will provide greater validity and public access to these clinical parameters and will bring greater insight into nuances in treatment plans that may enhance quality of life for particular patient groups.

Cost-Utility and Cost-Effectiveness Research

As patient quality-of-life information becomes increasingly available to clinicians and health professionals, utilization of this data will lead to greater quality-driven care. Health utility models and cost-effectiveness studies are already increasingly utilized to capture the cost-efficacy of neurosurgical interventions and provide quantification of the quality of life impact as well as social cost implications of surgical interventions [30]. Investigations in cost-effectiveness of interventions allow for mathematical modeling to determine if the gains in quality of life after medical or surgical interventions justify the individual or social costs incurred by that treatment [31, 32]. Through having consistent, high-quality data that captures quality of life before and after interventions, quality of cost-effectiveness studies will further guide patient management and health policy.

Conclusion

It is evident that in the new era of medicine, assessment of quality will continue to be vital in patient counseling and the overall care provided. Profound understanding of quality should be emphasized early on during medical education. Moreover, better integration of quality metrics into clinical practice will improve overall patient care and outcomes.

Creation of a more comprehensive quality measure will require more perspectives from other healthcare systems to be obtained. Understanding the architecture, success, and challenges faced by other systems will aid in assessing scalability of quality assessment internationally.

References

1. Quality | Definition of quality in English by Oxford dictionaries [Internet]. Oxf Dictionaries Engl [cited 2018 Jun 7]. Available from: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/quality
2. Porter ME, Thomas H, Lee MD. The strategy that will fix health care. Harv Bus Rev [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2018 Jun 8]. Available from: https://hbr.org/2013/10/the-strategy-that-will-fix-health-care
3. Porter ME. What is value in health care? N Engl J Med. 2010;363:2477–81.
4. Marjoua Y, Bozic KJ. Brief history of quality movement in US healthcare. Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med. 2012;5:265–73.
5. Parekh AK. Revisiting health care's value equation. Milbank Q [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2018 Jun 7]. Available from: https://www.milbank.org/quarterly/articles/revisiting-health-cares-value-equation/
6. Makadon HJ, Bharucha F, Gavin M, Oliveira J, Wietecha M. Value management: optimizing quality, service, and cost. J Healthc Qual. 32:29–34.
7. Measuring outcomes – Institute for strategy and competitiveness – Harvard Business School [Internet]. [cited 2018 Jun 8]. Available from: https://www.isc.hbs.edu/health-care/vbhcd/Pages/measuring-outcomes.aspx
8. Hariri O, Takayanagi A, Miulli DE, Siddiqi J, Vrionis F. Minimally invasive surgical techniques for management of painful metastatic and primary spinal tumors. Cureus. 2017;9:e1114.
9. Nuckols TK, Escarce JJ, Asch SM. The effects of quality of care on costs: a conceptual framework. Milbank Q. 2013;91:316–53.
10. Godil SS, Parker SL, Zuckerman SL, Mendenhall SK, Devin CJ, Asher AL, et al. Determining the quality and effectiveness of surgical spine care: patient satisfaction is not a valid proxy. Spine J. 2013;13:1006–12.
11. Cleary PD, Edgman-Levitan S. Health care quality. Incorporating consumer perspectives. JAMA. 1997;278:1608–12.
12. Smith J, Medalia C. Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2014 [Internet]. Census.gov. [cited 2018 Jun 10]. Available from: https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2015/demo/p60-253.html
13. Medicare C for, Baltimore MS 7500 SB, Usa M. NHE-Fact-Sheet [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2018 Jun 10]. Available from: https://www.cms.gov/research-statistics-data-and-systems/statistics-trends-and-reports/nationalhealthexpenddata/nhe-fact-sheet.html
14. Vaccaro AR, Bono CM. The future direction of minimally invasive surgery: is its fate controlled by the physician, patient, industry, or insurance? Minim Invasive Spine Surg. CRC Press; 2007.
15. Campbell SM, Roland MO, Buetow SA. Defining quality of care. Soc Sci Med. 2000;51:1611–25.
16. Caveats to consider when calculating healthcare value – The American Journal of Medicine [Internet]. [cited 2018 Jun 8]. Available from: https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343(14)01087-0/fulltext
17. Deyo RA, Mirza SK, Martin BI, Kreuter W, Goodman DC, Jarvik JG. Trends, major medical complications, and charges associated with surgery for lumbar spinal stenosis in older adults. JAMA. 2010;303:1259–65.
18. Puolakka K, Ylinen J, Neva MH, Kautiainen H, Häkkinen A. Risk factors for back pain-related loss of working time after surgery for lumbar disc herniation: a 5-year follow-up study. Eur Spine J. 2008;17:386–92.
19. Kennedy RH. Fracture of the shaft of both bones of the leg. Ann Surg. 1931;93:563–86.
20. Vanti C, Prosperi D, Boschi M. The Prolo Scale: history, evolution and psychometric properties. J Orthop Traumatol. 2013;14:235–45.
21. Dawson EG, Lotysch M, Urist MR. Intertransverse process lumbar arthrodesis with autogenous bone graft. Clin Orthop. 1981:90–6.

22. Prolo DJ, Oklund SA, Butcher M. Toward uniformity in evaluating results of lumbar spine operations. A paradigm applied to posterior lumbar interbody fusions. Spine. 1986;11:601–6.
23. Brazier JE, Roberts J. The estimation of a preference-based measure of health from the SF-12. Med Care. 2004;42:851–9.
24. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry disability index. Spine. 2000;25:2940–52. discussion 2952
25. Williams A. The role of the Euroqol instrument in QALY calculations [Internet]. Centre for Health Economics, University of York; 1995 Mar. Report No.: 130chedp. Available from: https://ideas.repec.org/p/chy/respap/130chedp.html
26. Gershon RC, Rothrock N, Hanrahan R, Bass M, Cella D. The use of PROMIS and assessment center to deliver patient-reported outcome measures in clinical research. J Appl Meas. 2010;11:304–14.
27. Wagner LI, Schink J, Bass M, Patel S, Diaz MV, Rothrock N, et al. Bringing PROMIS to practice: brief and precise symptom screening in ambulatory cancer care. Cancer. 2015;121:927–34.
28. Alonso J, Bartlett SJ, Rose M, Aaronson NK, Chaplin JE, Efficace F, et al. The case for an international patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS®) initiative. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2013, 11:210.
29. Azad TD, Kalani M, Wolf T, Kearney A, Lee Y, Flannery L, et al. Building an electronic health record integrated quality of life outcomes registry for spine surgery. J Neurosurg Spine. 2016;24:176–85.
30. Wali AR, Brandel MG, Santiago-Dieppa DR, Rennert RC, Steinberg JA, Hirshman BR, et al. Markov modeling for the neurosurgeon: a review of the literature and an introduction to cost-effectiveness research. Neurosurg Focus. 2018;44:E20.
31. Shepard DS. Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine. In: Gold MR, Siegel JE, Russell LB, Weinstein MC, editors. New York: Oxford University Press; 1996. J Ment Health Policy Econ 2:91–2.
32. Weinstein MC, Stason WB. Foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis for health and medical practices. N Engl J Med. 1977;296:716–21.

Quality and Standardization of Medical Education

2

Jonathan P. Scoville and Erica F. Bisson

Abbreviations

AAMC	Association of American Medical Colleges
ACGME	Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education
AMA	American Medical Association
CACMS	Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools
EMR	Electronic Medical Record
LCME	Liaison Committee on Medical Education
MSPE	Medical Student Performance Evaluation
SLOE	Standardized Letter of Evaluation
USN&WR	US News and World Report
USMLE	United States Medical Licensing Examination

Introduction

As medical schools in the United States and around the world attempt to balance the principles of standardization, modernization, and tradition, they may struggle to maintain focus on the core values of education while implementing more modern or at times more politically expedient methods of teaching. These goals of expediency and education are often paradoxical, because although the ultimate goal of medical education should be to create a physician and lifelong learner with the tools necessary to succeed in a chosen specialty, medical students and residency programs alike feel that student preparation at times falls short [1]. Whereas the aim for medical

J. P. Scoville · E. F. Bisson (✉)
Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical Neurosciences Center, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
e-mail: erica.bisson@hsc.utah.edu

J. Ratliff et al. (eds.), *Quality Spine Care*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97990-8_2